



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,546	10/10/2003	K. M. Slimak	TPP 31413DIV	9719
77176	7590	03/03/2010		
Novak, Druce & Quigg LLP 1300 I Street, N.W. Suite 1000, West Tower WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER WINSTON, RANDALL O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1
2
3
4
5 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
6

7 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
8

9
10 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
11 AND INTERFERENCES

12 *Ex parte* K. M. SLIMAK
13

14 Appeal 2009-007992
15 Application 10/682,546
16 Group Art Unit 1600
17

18 Oral Hearing Held: February 2, 2010
19

20
21 Before TONI R. SCHEINER, DONALD E. ADAMS, and
22 LORA M. GREEN, Administrative Patent Judges.
23

24 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS:
25

26 THOMAS P. PAVELKO, ESQ.

27 Novak Druce & Quigg, LLP
28 1300 Eye Street, N.W.
29 1000 West Tower
30 Washington, D.C. 20005
31 (202) 659-0100
32
33
34
35

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday,
2 February 2, 2010, commencing at 9:05 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and
3 Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Alexandria, Virginia,
4 before Jan M. Jablonsky, Notary Public.

5 THE CLERK: Good morning. Calendar number 5, appeal
6 number 2009-007992, Mr. Pavelko.

7 JUDGE SCHEINER: Good morning.

8 MR. PAVELKO: Good morning.

9 JUDGE SCHEINER: Do you have a business card?

10 MR. PAVELKO: Yes, I do. This appeal involves just one --
11 first paragraph of all the claims. This is a continuation of division, I believe
12 -- I don't know what we called it, but it's a continuing case of a parent
13 application issued as a patent. The parent case was dealing with treating
14 some disease, symptoms of diseases or conditions.

15 In this case, we don't claim that at all. Yet the Examiner still
16 perceives that that's what our invention is. He says we are enabled for
17 certain treatments of conditions, symptoms, or diseases. And then he goes
18 about saying, well, we're not limited to that, therefore our claims are not
19 supported by the specification.

20 In response, I would just ask the Board to, you know, read the
21 independent Claim 1 or 20. It's a relatively straightforward claim, method
22 for dietary intervention, withholding all food from an animal for at least five
23 days, except for tropical root crops, and feeding a concentrated form of
24 tropical root crops to the animal for the at-least-five-day period. That's
25 Claim 1. It doesn't have anything to do with treating. It doesn't say doing
26 anything.

1 If you read the specification, there is a portion of the
2 specification where it talks about treating diseases, symptoms, or conditions.
3 There is also a lot of the specification that says there are other reasons for
4 doing this. This particular inventor is an allergist. Many people have food
5 allergies.

6 She has come up with a lot of cute phrases or slogans here: "If
7 you don't eat it, it can't hurt you."

8 So, what she has done, instead of trying to test for all the
9 possible food allergies somebody might have, she has come the other way
10 around, and eliminated everything except these concentrated forms of
11 tropical root crops. They are concentrated because, as she says in the
12 specification, you could not get enough food sustenance from eating a raw or
13 a fresh or a cooked whole fruit or crop, because there is just not enough
14 calorie intake in that. So she's got to concentrate that to make it a smaller
15 proportion, but higher yield of calories.

16 And by taking only this tropical root crop, which is unusual
17 food for most people in the Northern Hemisphere or United States, you're
18 eliminating what they would normally eat. So you start off with this. If you
19 still have the allergies, you know it's even in the tropical root crops. But if
20 you don't have the allergy, then as we go into some of the dependent claims,
21 we can introduce certain foods in a rotation, and then see if the allergy or
22 conditions of the food allergy reappear. And this way, you know, that is
23 exactly what she says -- one of the reasons she would do this particular
24 method. It has nothing to do with treating a disease, condition, or symptom.

25
26 And we pointed this out to the Examiner. We pointed out that
27 we're not claiming what he thinks we're claiming, we pointed out case law

1 that says, you know, really, 112, second paragraph leaves it to the inventor
2 to define the invention, not to the Examiner. And we pointed out we're just
3 not trying to claim this. He doesn't want to listen. He just continues to say
4 we're only enabled for treating certain diseases, which is not what this claim
5 method is about.

6 And so, for those reasons, we believe the rejection is not –

7 JUDGE SCHEINER: Well, I think we understand those issues.

8 Do you have anything –

9 MR. PAVELKO: Thank you very much.

10 JUDGE SCHEINER: Unless you had something further to add,
11 I think we do understand the issue.

12 MR. PAVELKO: Okay.

13 Whereupon, at 9:09 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20